APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/467,544	12/10/1999	KATHRIN BERKNER	74451.P103	2523

7590 10/31/2005		

MICHAEL J MALLIE
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 WISHIRE BOULEVARD 7TH FLR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER
PERUNGAVOOR, SATHYANARAYA V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>14 October 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☒ The period for reply expires <u>3 </u>months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

     Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

     NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: <u>6,7,38,39,56,57,71,72,78,79,84 and 85</u>.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5,8-37,40-55,58-70,73-77,80-83,86 and 87</u>.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

13. ☐ Other: _____.

Sath V Perungavoor
Examiner
Art Unit: 2625

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claim 1, applicant argues the following: Vuylsteke does not disclose "performing multiscale unsharp masking on the input data using different scale dependent parameters for different scales based on the source of input data". Examiner respectfully disagrees. Vuylsteke discloses the limitation as follows: performing multiscale unsharp masking on the input data using different scale dependent parameters (g1 ... gL-1) for different scales based on the source of input data. As can be seen Vuylsteke's g1 ... gL-1 are scale dependent (i.e. 1 ... (L-1)), different for each scale and based on the input. Regarding claim 2, applicant argues the following: Boccignone does not disclose "modifying coefficients in at least two of the plurality of decomposition levels, to sharpen or smooth the coefficients, by scaling coefficients in the at least two decomposition levels using different scale dependent parameters for each of the decomposition levels". Examiner respectfully disagrees. It can be seen from Boccignone that ψ is scale dependent due to the presence of $2^{(-2j)}$ and it can be further seen that modification at a decomposition level is done by scaling with $2^{(-2j)}$. $2^{(-2j)}$ is different for each scale. Smoothing is performed with $\phi(x,y)$.

KANJIBHAI PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

2